

REMARKS

Claims 87, 99, and 100 have been amended. Claims 97 and 101 have been canceled. Claim 116 has been added. Claims 87-96, 98-100, and 102-116 are now pending. Applicant reserves the right to pursue the original claims and other claims in this and other applications. Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration of the above-referenced application in light of the amendments and following remarks.

The Title of the Invention has been amended to correspond more closely with the pending claims. Claim 99 has been amended to maintain proper antecedent basis. In addition, Applicant acknowledges with appreciation that claims 97, 99, and 101 are in condition for allowance if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims. Claim 87 has been amended to incorporate the allowable subject matter of dependent claim 97. Claim 100 has been amended to incorporate the allowable subject matter of dependent claim 101. The allowable subject matter of dependent claim 99 has been rewritten as new claim 116.

Claims 87-88, 100, 103, 108-109, and 112-115 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Juskey in view of Fukuoka. The rejection is respectfully traversed.

As indicated above, the allowable subject matter of dependent claim 97 has been incorporated into independent claim 87. Similarly, the allowable subject matter of dependent claim 101 has been incorporated into independent claim 100. Claims 88, 108-109, and 114-115 depend from amended claim 87. Claims 103 and 112-113 depend from amended claim 100. Claims 88, 103, 108-109, and 112-115 depend from allowable subject matter and should also be in condition for allowance along with their base claim. Accordingly, claims 87-88, 100, 103, 108-109, and 112-115 should be in condition for allowance and the § 103(a) rejection should be withdrawn.

Claims 89-90, 102, and 107 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Juskey and Fukuoka, and further in view of Fritz. The rejection is respectfully traversed.

Claims 89 and 90 depend from amended claim 87. Claims 102 and 107 depend from amended claim 100. Claims 89-90, 102, and 107 depend from allowable subject matter and should also be in condition for allowance along with their base claim. Accordingly, the § 103(a) rejection should be withdrawn.

Claims 91-96 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Juskey and Fukuoka, and further in view of Tracy. The rejection is respectfully traversed.

Claims 91-96 depend from the allowable subject matter of amended claim 87 and should also be in condition for allowance along with their base claim. Accordingly, the § 103(a) rejection should be withdrawn.

Claims 98 and 104-106 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Juskey and Fukuoka, and further in view of Nakagawa. The rejection is respectfully traversed.

Claim 98 depends from the allowable subject matter of amended claim 87. Claims 104-106 depend from the allowable subject matter of amended claim 100. Claims 98 and 104-106 should also be in condition for allowance along with their base claim. Accordingly, the § 103(a) rejection should be withdrawn.

Claims 110 and 111 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Juskey and Fukuoka, and further in view of Higgins. The rejection is respectfully traversed.

Claims 110 and 111 depend from the allowable subject matter of amended claim 100 and should also be in condition for allowance along with their base claim. Accordingly, the § 103(a) rejection should be withdrawn.

New claim 116 is also believed to be in condition for allowance. The allowable subject matter of dependent claim 99 has been rewritten as new claim 116. Accordingly, the prior art of record does not teach or suggest a method of forming a structure for supporting an integrated circuit chip comprising, "forming a substrate; forming an insulating layer over said substrate; providing a support surface for an integrated circuit chip, said substrate, insulating layer and support surface forming part of a chip carrier; and supporting an integrated circuit chip with said chip carrier, said chip carrier having a top and bottom surface, wherein a layer of magnetic field shielding material is formed on said integrated circuit chip, and wherein a second layer of magnetic field shielding material is formed on said chip carrier," as recited in claim 116.

In view of the above, each of the presently pending claims in this application contains subject matter that has been indicated as being allowable. Accordingly, the Examiner is respectfully requested to pass this application to issue.

Dated: December 15, 2004

Respectfully submitted,

By 

Thomas J. D'Amico

Registration No.: 28,371

DICKSTEIN SHAPIRO MORIN &

OSHINSKY LLP

2101 L Street NW

Washington, DC 20037-1526

(202) 785-9700

Attorney for Applicant